

be used to hire a cop, to buy computers for prosecutors or judges or telephone booths or lighting or whatever the Governor decided would relate to law enforcement functions. And 100 percent of the Federal funds could be used for this equipment, or to fund prosecutors, or to pay judge's salaries, without one single penny having to go to hire an additional cop.

I support many of these functions. In the crime bill, for example, we provide for a significant amount of money to the States to hire State judges. We put in money for new equipment. But we segregate, in the present crime law, almost \$9 billion. It says you must hire a sworn officer, that is somebody who is a criminal law enforcement officer. That is all you can do with the money now.

This new law proposed by the Republicans will, in fact, guarantee that we will not get 100,000 cops on the street. I am opposed to replacing the program that guarantees 100,000 new cops on our streets with the proposal that could spend over \$8 billion in Federal funds, without putting any new cops anywhere.

The Republican proposal suffers from an additional fatal flaw. It requires no fiscal accountability or responsibility. I find this fascinating. They are talking about tightening the budget, tightening spending. Here they are going to take over \$8 billion, with no accountability, and send it back to the States. Why do we not just have plain old revenue sharing? Why call this a crime bill? The bill uses a formula to simply hand out Federal funds to officials, with no strings attached and no accountability. That sounds great, does it not?

Well, the anticrime law requires that States and localities match Federal grants with their own money. And this match requirement is not born out of a lack of generosity on the part of the author of the bill, me or anybody else who voted for it. The offer of \$8.8 billion in Federal funds to assist what is purely a State and local function can hardly be characterized as not being generous. No, the reason I wrote in a match was to require accountability, a match required born out of experience.

I started my career as a county councilman, and I know how local officials work. God bless them, they have a tough job. We would sit there in budget meetings when I was a county official, councilperson, and somebody would say, well we are going to buy a new park, or do this in the park, or we are going to add two more police, and I or somebody else would say, how much is that going to cost? I am not exaggerating when I say the answer would come back that it will not cost anything. Wait a minute, you just said we are going to hire two new cops. They said, that is Federal money. That is Federal money, and it is not going to cost anything. Well, it is my tax dollars.

So I found when a county or city has to put up some money for a program, they think twice about whether or not they really want it. Remember the al-

legations in the old LEAA Program, where police departments are out buying Dick Tracy wristwatches, purchasing riot control gear in small towns that never even thought about a riot? In the LEAA Program, we went a long way to begin to work toward using our money wisely. We built in three key concepts. We targeted law enforcement to aid specific programs; required a match of one State or local dollar for every three Federal dollars that we spend, and required extensive State plans to explain what they are going to use the Federal dollars for. We do not demand that they do anything, except tell us what they are going to use them for.

The resulting law was what we called the Byrne Grant Program, which is a predecessor to this crime bill, a fiscally responsible, well-run program that continues today. The same concept marks the essential elements of the anticrime law for 100,000 cops. In fact, we even improve the Byrne concept in one respect. We permit localities, not just Governors, to apply directly for the funds to ensure that the money gets where it is most needed.

I think my Republican colleagues should go back and look at the experience of LEAA before they pursue their proposal of block grants for police and any other purpose. Their proposal is an \$8.5 billion giveaway of Federal dollars with no specific goals, with loopholes, and loose language that would permit every cent to be spent without any increase in police on the streets to show for our investment at the end of the 5 years.

In contrast, the anti-crime law enacted last year, which was bipartisanly constructed in the first instance, builds on the LEAA lessons. It sets specific goals, provides a simplified application, requires accountability for evaluation and matching requirements. In addition, the matching requirement is set up so the local share increases from year to year. In this way, we ensure that local dollars are to be used responsibly.

I see my time is coming to a close. Those who say, wait a minute now, BIDEN, under your bill that is now law, you required the States to kick in money. I say, yes, that is right. They say, well, in our bill we do not. Well, I ask a rhetorical question. This bill they are going to offer is a block grant for 5 years. Say they go out and hire cops for the local communities with block grant money and we pay for all of it for 5 years; what happens at the end of 5 years? The Federal Government is guaranteeing that we are going to take over local law enforcement costs for the rest of eternity? Is that what we are saying? No. In 5 years, the mayor has to go back to the taxpayers and say, hey, now we have 50 cops on the street, 10 are being paid for by Federal dollars. We no longer have those Federal dollars. Now I have to raise your taxes or cut the 10 cops.

Is it not wiser to make that decision at the front end, where you have to go

to the voters or your community and ask, do we want more cops? The Federal Government will give us \$70,000 to start off here, to keep this cop for 5 years, and we are going to have to kick in probably \$50,000 over that 5-year period. At the end of the process, we have to pick it up. What do you want to do? I think it is time we asked citizens to be as responsible as legislators should be and are not. That is, if you want to have more cops, it costs money, flat out. It costs money.

The local officials should have the guts to go to their constituency and stop talking about how tough they are.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized.

#### FEDERAL LANDS ACT FOREST HEALTH AMENDMENTS OF 1995

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, along with Senators HEFLIN, MURKOWSKI, GORTON, DOMENICI, BURNS, PACKWOOD, KEMPTHORNE, and a statement of support from the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, I will, in the near future, introduce the Federal Lands Act Forest Health Amendments of 1995.

Mr. President, for some time I have attempted, along with others, to bring to the attention of this Senate the serious deterioration of this country's forest lands from a variety of ills, including drought, insect and disease attacks, and natural wildfires. We have come to understand that these problems, in combination, affect millions of acres of Federal, State, and private forest lands, and they have advanced to a point that they simply demand the attention of this Congress.

It should be no surprise to any of us. Numerous recent reports from the scientific community, one of them called "Assessing Forest Ecosystem Health in the Inland West" and the "Report of the National Commission on Wildfires," predicted intense wildfire events as a consequence of the forest health problems that this legislation will speak to. Many believe these costly fires will continue, unless there is an aggressive action by man to work with Mother Nature in attempting to deal with this situation. Scientists and forest managers met in Sun Valley in my State in 1993, and warned us with a very terse message, that we had "A brief window of opportunity, perhaps 15-30 years in length"—and in the life of a forest, that is but the blink of an eye—to reverse this very unnatural cycle of fire that we were moving into.

And, of course, last summer, it was so vividly dramatized in the inland West, as 4 million acres of unhealthy timber burst into fire, killing people, destroying homes, destroying ecosystems and wildlife and damaging riparian areas, and at a cost of \$1 billion to the Federal Government in its attempt to suppress these fires, when,

in many instances, they simply had to back away and watch the violence of the fires and the destruction that occurred.

Do not be misled by those who proclaim that wildfire is beneficial to the environment because of a natural mosaic of vegetation that would be created. The 1994 fires were way outside the normal and the historic range. Damage to every component of the environment was so extensive that it will really cost us hundreds of years to begin to repair that kind of damage. A draft environmental impact statement just released by the Boise National Forest in my State documents long-term, severe damages to watersheds, soils, fisheries, and wildlife from last summer's fires that will be, as I mentioned, decades and decades and decades in repair.

The only way we can deal with this serious problem is to develop and implement equally serious management strategies and allow our national forests our foresters in the scientific community to break the cycle of the forests that are in decline with this kind of mortality as a result of the disease, the insects, and the drought.

My bill, titled the "Federal Lands Act Forest Health Amendments of 1995," is an attempt to do just that. It is now gaining bipartisan support. We will want to move it very rapidly through the two committees of jurisdiction and bring it to the floor of this Senate for debate, while a similar bill will move in the House.

This bill will set the management procedures in place to identify the highest priority forest health problem areas on the national forests, the public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management and the public domain wildlife refuges. Once the areas are identified, this bill requires the agencies to take aggressive action to restore forest health. Most notably, the legislation would relieve some of the procedural impediments which have tied the agencies' hands. Our aim will be to alter unhealthy forest vegetation through thinning and other cultural practices so the forest more nearly conforms to the historic patterns which once prevailed. Once there, the forest ecosystem can be maintained through scientific management.

I see this forest health legislation as a long-term solution to the problem at hand. Years of concentrated effort will be needed to treat millions of acres now in trouble and restore them to conditions which are within the expected natural patterns and cycles. Though our western forests are in particular crisis now, forest health problems have surfaced in southern forests as well as in the northeastern and Lakes States, and this legislation would be very useful in those circumstances.

As with most difficult situations, there is an opportunity here. As forest health activities are implemented, benefits will be gained for fish and wildlife

habitat, water quality, scenic values and for all components of the ecosystem. That is the end result we want. At the same time, the activities needed to accomplish that end will generate forest products, jobs, and economic returns to the local economies which have been badly hurt by the shrunk timber supply.

We do not need to be risking lives and property fighting these unnatural wildfires. We don't need to be spending a billion dollars on fire suppression when we could be taking effective preventive action to reduce risk. We do not need to watch our natural resources go up in smoke when there is a critical need for wood fiber to sustain our industry and communities. Forest health crises are preventable, and I am committed to bringing solutions before the Congress. That is why I will introduce this legislation.

Our time, our window of opportunity, as I mentioned, is very narrow. I hope that my colleagues will join with me in a serious effort at working with the Forest Service to resolve the crisis that our forests are now in.

Yes, for the time being, we are receiving abnormally high moisture levels in the inland West. But still, over the long period of drought, the accumulated moisture continues to decline, and along with that is the direct decline of the forests' health. Clearly next year, we would set ourselves up for another summer of fire and destruction and, tragically, the possibility of life lost, the kind that we saw in Colorado, in my State of Idaho, in Oregon, in Montana, and certainly in Washington and California this past year.

Something has to be done. I believe my legislation will start us in that direction. And it would be foolish for this Senate, this Congress, this administration to simply set idly by and say, "Oh, but it is Mother Nature at her finest." It is Mother Nature at her worst, because part of the problem that we are dealing with is the result of our inability to manage fires over the years and our failure to recognize that there was a national ebb and flow of the ecosystem that we have severely damaged and it will take our work, our efforts, and our cooperation with Mother Nature to begin to right this process.

So I hope my colleagues will join with me in this effort and become cosponsors of the legislation that we will be introducing.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, legislation will be introduced soon that takes our Nation an important step closer to avoiding devastating wildfires in our national forests. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the legislation to be introduced by the senior Senator from Idaho—the Forest Health Amendments of 1995.

Last year, wildfires raged across the Western United States. The fire season started in early summer and by the time the smoke had cleared nearly 3 million acres of land in the Western United States had burned—double the

amount of 1993. In the States of Washington and Oregon alone, nearly 1.4 billion board feet of Federal timber burned.

Last summer, after listening closely to the concerns of Washington State residents, I offered an amendment during the House-Senate Interior Appropriations conference to provide the Forest Service with the authority to expedite these salvage sales. Unfortunately, I could not convince the members of the conference committee to include my amendment in the report. And, unfortunately, the burned timber is still sitting on the ground.

Today, most, if not all, of the 1.4 billion board feet remains on the ground in Oregon and Washington. Obviously not all of the 1.4 billion board feet of timber that burned last summer would be eligible for harvest. According to the Forest Service calculations, usually 50 percent of the total volume burned in a wildfire can be salvaged. Consequently, roughly 700 million board feet is eligible for some type of salvaging activity. But, once again, the Forest Service has made only token efforts to prepare the sales necessary to get in and get up this valuable timber. The urgency is based upon the fact that burnt, dead, or dying timber loses its value rapidly.

The ramifications of inaction by the Forest Service in preparing these sales is twofold: These sales will provide small sawmills and logging companies in the Northwest—literally on verge of going out of business—some much needed wood supply. Beyond this, it is critical to remember that if the timber is left to rot on the forest floor it will be setting the stage for yet another devastating fire season this coming summer. Mr. President, inaction on the part of the Forest Service not only hurts working people, but it also hurts the environment.

Regrettably, inaction is exactly what we are getting from the Forest Service. In response to the wildfires from last summer the Forest Service began to study the forest health issue. Last December the Service issued a report on its study entitled the "Western Forest Health Initiative." The report highlighted 330 forest health-related projects in the Western United States. The majority of these projects, however, were not developed in response to the wildfires of the summer. For instance, in Washington and Oregon, only 40 projects were identified in response to the summer fires. Of the 40 projects, only a few were actual salvaging operations.

Mr. President, the people in my State are asking themselves "why?" Why isn't the Forest Service going into the burned out areas and getting up the timber? Why isn't the Forest Service restoring the health of our forests, and putting people back to work? The answer is, of course, in large part driven by the fact that the Forest Service will most likely go to court if it begins

even a modest effort to conduct salvage operations.

Mr. President, the people in my State are frustrated. They are frustrated with a Federal Government that is so petrified by the potential filing of law suits that it will not undertake even the most limited of management activities in our Nation's forests.

The legislation to be introduced by the Senator from Idaho would ease some of this frustration. The Forest Health Amendments of 1995 would require the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to conduct a yearly review on the status of the health of our Nation's forests. The bill would continue to grant the right to appeal a project, but would limit the timeframe for such an appeal. The bill grants the authority to allow for an environmental assessment on an individual project versus the more costly and time consuming environmental impact statement. The bill would also allow for the Forest Service to prioritize forest health needs as an emergency or high-risk area.

The legislation to be introduced will not be enacted soon enough to conduct salvage operations in response to last year's wildfires. This Senator has already begun to work with his colleagues in the Northwest congressional delegation to put together an amendment that will address the salvage sitting on the ground from last year's fires, and other short-term timber supply issues for the region.

Mr. President, this legislation will provide the Forest Service with some much needed direction. We cannot, and should not, stop managing our forests because of the obstructionists tactics of a few groups and individuals. If we do, we will be confronted with devastating wildfires—like last year—on an annual basis. I encourage my colleagues to work with this Senator and the Senator from Idaho to enact this legislation, and bring some common sense back to the management of our Nation's forests.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, my colleagues should be well aware of my sentiments toward a runaway train, known as the Federal bureaucracy, and its effect on individuals and small businesses in this country through the regulatory process. I have spoken of this situation, here on the floor of the Senate, in the past. My colleagues should also be well aware of my commitment to the principle of multiple-use regarding Federal lands. This principle was established in the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act of 1976, known as FLPMA.

Today, I am here to support an effort to streamline a part of the regulatory and decisionmaking process regarding the management of federally controlled forest lands. In the course of this section, I am also hopeful that we will aid individuals and small businesses whose livelihoods depend on the sustainable development of our forest resources.

Mr. President, I am here today as a cosponsor of the Federal Lands Act Forest Health Amendments of 1995, to be introduced by Senator CRAIG. These amendments are, indeed, needed, as we all witnessed the tragic losses of life and property to fires that devastated many areas in the Western United States this last year, including parts of New Mexico.

In regard to the issue of forest health addressed by these amendments, I have read report after report, each describing how the state of affairs in the forests administered by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management are in decline. At the same time, I have heard over and over how every step that he professional land managers we have entrusted with the care of these treasured lands is challenged through either administrative appeals or in the courts. These endless challenges, no matter how well intentioned, have tied the hands of the land management agencies to the point that almost every activity related to scientifically supported treatment of even the most devastated areas is effectively halted.

Mr. President, this must stop. I believe that this legislation will be a significant benefit to our forests, and the people who live and work in and around them. It will establish criteria that will allow the responsible agencies to place areas most in need of corrective management in a high priority designation of either emergency or high-risk forest health areas. Further, when we say emergency, we mean emergency. One of the criteria for designation as an emergency area is that 50 percent of the trees are either dead or will likely die within 2 years. Let me repeat that standard for emergency designation: half of the trees are either dead or will soon die.

Included in the decision to designate an area as a forest health emergency or high-risk area will be a listing of the authorized corrective activities that will be undertaken to improve conditions in the affected areas. None of these management activities will be beyond the scope of actions already approved in the appropriate land management plan.

This is an innovative approach to expedite the bureaucratic process, and one that will create a finite time from proposal to actual on-the-ground activities. This should, by no means, indicate that we here in Congress are trying to keep the public from participating in the process. We provide for a public comment period following the publication of the proposal in the Federal Register. We are also not attempting to cut off the opportunity for appeals. A period during which appeals can be filed is also required. We are quite simply providing a process by which constructive and corrective actions can be applied in the most dire of circumstances, where the continued inaction that occurs under the current system can only result in further deg-

radation of our treasured forest resources.

Finally, Mr. President, this legislation will require the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to report annually to the Congress on activities carried out under this provision. In this report, the Secretaries will also inform the Congress of the current status of forest health on Federal lands, describe problems that have been encountered over the previous year, and indicate initiatives expected for the next year.

In closing, I want to commend Senator CRAIG for his commitment to resolving the problems faced by the Federal land management agencies, and for his leadership in bringing the issue of forest health to the forefront here in the Senate.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, first, I would like to commend my colleague, Senator CRAIG, for bringing this issue to the floor of the Senate for debate.

As some of you will remember, last summer catastrophic forest fires swept across the west. Governors were forced to declare states of emergency. We saw devastating loss of life—and I ask you to recall for a moment the 14 firefighters who lost their lives in Colorado, there were other as well—of property, of habitat, and of economic resources that rural communities in States like Idaho depend on.

Some of these fires burned so wild and so hot that we could only wait for winter snows to put them out. But when the final fires were controlled, and the tallies taken, the numbers showed that my State of Idaho suffered the most timber lost of any State—over 1.5 billion board feet—enough timber to build over 137,000 homes, and to provide jobs for up to 35,000 people.

Idaho was not alone. Our neighboring States suffered as well. The Forest Service alone spent \$757 million fighting fires across the west. That does not include the expenses by BLM, the States, and other agencies.

I would like to be able to tell you that this past summer was a fluke and that it hadn't happened before, and won't happen again. But that is not the case. These forest fires will come again. High fuel loads, long-term drought that made our forests susceptible to disease and insect infestations are all still threatening our forests. Huge stands of dead and dying timber are ready and waiting to go up like a tinderbox again next summer or the summer after that.

We cannot bring the rain to end the drought—that talent is in higher hands than ours. But we can take action with the tools that were given to us. We can manage those forests so that they provide the timber, the habitat, and the recreation opportunities that we depend on. This bill will give the Forest Service the flexibility to manage forests in a timely manner to get salvage sales out within the window of opportunity.

Keep in mind that not all of that 1.5 billion board feet of timber damaged in the fires had been approved for timber harvest. Far from it. The local forest supervisors have taken into consideration habitat and other environmental requirements, and have set aside possibly as much as 90 percent of the timber that was burned to meet other needs besides economic ones. But the remaining timber is harvestable, and if we do not expedite the handling of that timber, and harvest it within the limited 2-year window of opportunity, then the value of that wood is lost.

Rural communities of Idaho and other western States depend on the income from these Federal sales, for direct revenue and income for schools and county roads. This letter from the Cambridge School District explains the need of Idaho schools for a dependable, steady timber supply. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be made part of the RECORD.

It is Congress' responsibility to ensure that Federal agencies are serving the public efficiently and effectively. The timeclock is ticking. Let's serve the public we were sent here to work for, and pass this bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMBRIDGE SCHOOL DISTRICT #432-J,  
November 15, 1994.

DIRK KEMPTHORNE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. KEMPTHORNE: The summer of 1994 saw catastrophic fires in many of our forests and a great deal of salvageable timber remains in areas burnt over. That salvage timber deteriorates rapidly if not recovered and it is in the best interests of our society to avoid waste of natural resources. Many of Idaho School Districts receive significant revenues from the sale of timber resources from the federal forests in Idaho to fund educational programs.

The Cambridge School Board would like to join and support a position calling for the salvage of recoverable timber in a manner consistent with sound environmental practice and to encourage the Forest Service and the Idaho Department of Lands to expedite that salvage to maximize local government revenues and to provide citizens of Idaho with expanded job opportunities.

Education funding in Idaho is greatly influenced by the use of natural resources in our state.

Sincerely,

CYNTHIA K. JONES,  
Chairman.  
SHARON M. STIPPICH,  
Vice Chairman.  
KATHRYN WERT,  
Trustee.  
DOUGLAS HANSEN,  
Trustee.  
ELLIS E. PEARSON,  
Trustee.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a very important issue in the Pacific Northwest: inland forest health. Earlier today, my colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, spoke about legislation to address a serious forest health problem plaguing forests throughout the inland west. He very accurately described the problems

of disease, insect infestations, and drought that are prevalent in many such forests, and which can lead to serious forest fires.

I commend Senator CRAIG for his work on this issue. He is correct that serious forest health problems exist in many areas, and he is correct that we should try to do something about it. The reasons are very simple. Healthy forests are essential to ensuring long-term economic sustainability in rural communities; they are essential to our standard of living; and they are essential to maintaining a healthy environment.

Growing trees provide many benefits. They shade spawning streams, they stabilize soil and prevent erosion, they provide wildlife habitat, they consume carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. They also provide wood for our home, paper for our schools, shelter for our communities, and recreation for the people. In short, they are many things to many people. If we strengthen our forests, we strengthen our communities. Of course, the reverse is also true. If we weaken our forests, we weaken our society in many ways.

So it is important that we do what we can to keep our forests as healthy as possible.

I would like to support a forest health bill. Given the passions inflamed when Congress starts legislating forest policy, I believe it is incumbent on us to proceed cautiously if we hope to achieve any results. Above all, we must not go too far. We need a forest health bill that addresses legitimate problems and reflects the public's view regarding management of our public lands.

I have already talked about some of these problems. What about the public view? We know the public enjoys its parks and wilderness areas. We know the public appreciates aesthetic, wildlife, roadless, and old growth values. But we also know the public has a voracious appetite for wood products. So, as is so often the case, our challenge and our responsibility as legislators is to strike the right balance.

I have a few concerns I hope can be addressed as we enter the forest health debate. I have touched on a few already: We need to make sure we are taking steps to address legitimate, serious problems. We need to avoid costly, catastrophic fires. The fires we saw last summer ravaged thousands of acres, cost a billion dollars to fight, and did no one any good. We need to avoid diseases and insect problems as well.

We also need to keep in mind what's going on downstream. People in the Pacific Northwest have spent the last few years trying to refine the concept of watershed-based management. In Tacoma last year, Representative NORM DICKS and myself convened a conference of nearly a thousand people to discuss watershed issue. Agency managers, fishers, private land owners, wildlife specialists, water users, con-

servationists, and citizens of all types came together to recognize the importance of watersheds as a resource management unit.

We are finding more often than not many land-use questions are becoming aquatic questions. In other words, what happens downstream is quite often affected by what happens upstream. Our entire resource-based economy is connected one way or another by the streams and rivers that criss-cross the region.

I believe there is ample room for proactive management of forest health problems and consideration of aquatic issues. The connection between these two issue sets is a concept I would like to introduce in the debate over Senator CRAIG's upcoming legislation.

We also need to make sure management actions are science-based. The good news is that very few people in the scientific community disagree over management prescriptions that can help improve forest health. Just the same, I think it is important to make it clear that the goal of achieving good forest health, and the steps taken to reach it, are based in sound science.

Finally, I want to say a few words about the broader issue of ecosystem management. This is a concept that has been very popular in recent years. It suggests that active resource management and usage can be reconciled with strong conservation goals. It suggests we can make decisions on a broad basis so we can avoid stumbling into problems on a case-by-case basis. These are goals that I strongly support.

But the problem remains that ecosystem management is still just loosely defined. And of course, the devil is always in the detail. Last year, Senator HATFIELD introduced legislation that I cosponsored to define the concept of ecosystem management more clearly. The goal is to arrive at a set of principles or standards that can guide long-term resource management decisions.

I believe this is still the proper course of action. Until we have a clear goal in sight, it is not necessarily wise to proceed quickly with rifle-shot solutions to short- or intermediate-term problems that may not repeat themselves. So I encourage my colleagues, and people from the region, to consider some of the threshold questions that remain unanswered.

Mr. President, there are other issues that I have not touched on but which I hope can be discussed in the context of forest health. Again, I commend the Senator from Idaho for his work. I hope to work with him and other Senators from the region in a bipartisan way to come up with solutions that work for the people.

FEDERAL LANDS ACT FOREST HEALTH  
AMENDMENTS OF 1995

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Americans rely on the national forests for a wide variety of activities, ranging from timber harvesting to recreation and

the conservation of wildlife. It is incumbent upon us to maintain those forests in the healthiest condition possible.

Unfortunately, throughout the country, and particularly in the intermountain west, forests are in poor shape. Persistent drought, disease, and insect infestation have created stands of dead and dying trees that pose a serious risk of fire. The forest fires that last summer burned thousands of acres of forest throughout the West and claimed the lives of men and women of the Forest Service provide bleak evidence of the problem. If we are to manage national forest ecosystems in ways that provide the services that Americans have come to expect, supply them in a sustainable manner and support the diversity of habitat needed to maintain fish and wildlife, then we must confront the forest health issue squarely.

Senator CRAIG will soon introduce the Federal Lands Act Health Amendments of 1995, which is intended to establish a more deliberate and timely process for dealing with forest health problems. I commend Senator CRAIG for focusing attention on forest health and look forward to continuing our collaborative effort on this issue and on the broader issue of ecosystem management. As a result of the Craig bill and the forthcoming discussions that it will generate, I expect Congress to develop a reasonable and effective response to this problem.

Over the last 2 years, as chairman and ranking member of the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Research, Conservation, Forestry, and General Legislation, Senator CRAIG and I held hearings on the management of the Federal lands. The subcommittee held two hearings on ecosystem management, a third on the new appeal process, and a fourth on the issue of forest health.

From those hearings, and through my experiences in working with wildlife managers, members of the timber industry and environmentalists, it has become clear that federally managed forests in some areas of the country suffer from problems related to drought, past mismanagement, and insect infestation and disease. The high incidence of tree mortality and fires in some national forests suggest that we still have much to learn about the causes of these problems and how to manage these complex systems.

The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management should place a higher priority on dealing with forest health problems before they become worse. To do so effectively, several important steps should be undertaken.

First, forest health problems need to be better defined. We must develop a shared vocabulary so that all those interested in maintaining healthy forests can work together in common cause.

Second, scientific research should be conducted to identify problems and evaluate options. Only by relying on

sound scientific data can we hope to proceed in an effective and defensible manner.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, we must set priorities. We must focus our attention on areas of greatest need, while ensuring that other issues are managed to prevent future problems.

And fourth, solutions must be developed and implemented in a timely manner.

Again, I appreciate Senator CRAIG's foresight and diligence in bringing to the attention of Congress the issue of forest health. This is a complicated issue that involves important objectives such as maintaining species habitat, ensuring that insect infestations and diseases are within a natural and healthy range, preventing soil erosion, and safeguarding the overall long-term sustainability of forest ecosystems.

The bill to be introduced by Senator CRAIG provides a valuable framework for addressing these critical issues. It will force Federal agencies to identify lands at risk and take concrete steps to improve forest health on those lands. In the long-run, the public should benefit by management activities taken as a result of this bill.

Senator CRAIG has expressed a desire to move this legislation through the necessary committees as expeditiously as possible. I support this goal, and look forward to participating in Agriculture Committee hearings on the bill. Concern has been raised that the legislation as currently written may provide overly broad discretion to the Federal agencies and that it may in some cases overburden those agencies with new responsibilities at a time when budget cuts hinder their ability to accomplish existing responsibilities. These issues merit further attention. Also, it is my hope that the Senate will examine the question of whether the bill assures sufficient opportunity for deliberation and analysis by the agencies and input by the public.

I look forward to working with Senator CRAIG to examine these questions and to move this bill through the appropriate committees and to the floor this year, so that we can begin to address forest health in a systematic, deliberate, thorough, and effective manner.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

#### REID AMENDMENT TO THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the amendment to the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that has been offered by the senior Senator from Nevada, Senator REID, and others of us. The purpose of the amendment is to protect the Social Security trust fund from being looted as part of an effort to balance the budget.

Mr. President, I think it is important for people to ask when we are considering a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution: What budget is being balanced? That is what this first chart asks. What budget is being balanced?

In order to answer that question, I think it is helpful to go to the actual language of the balanced budget amendment that is before us. And if you look at the language, it says very clearly:

Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States Government except those derived from borrowing. Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States Government except for those for repayment of debt principal.

So, Mr. President, it is very clear that what we are dealing with with respect to the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution is that all of the moneys coming into Federal coffers are being jackpotted. They are all being put in the same pot. Whether they are trust funds or not trust funds, it is all being put in the same pot. And then we are going to look at those total receipts and compare it to total outlays.

I prepared this chart. This is kind of the teapot of the Federal Government budget. It shows the revenue that goes into the pot, and the revenues are the individual income taxes that are raised. That provides about 45 percent of the revenue of the Federal Government. All social insurance taxes go into this pot, including the revenue that is taken out of people's paychecks every month that is supposed to be for Social Security. All of that money is going into the pot. Social insurance taxes are about 37 percent of the revenue of the Federal Government. Corporate income taxes go into the pot. That is about 10 percent of the revenue of our Government. All other taxes are 8 percent.

And then we look on the other end of the ledger. We look at what comes out of the spending spout of the Federal Government. And here is the spending breakdown. About 22 percent of the outlays of the Federal Government go for Social Security, 16 percent is interest on the debt, 16 percent for defense, 14 percent for Medicare, 7 percent for Medicaid, and other, 25 percent.

So one can see in the balanced budget amendment that is before us what goes into the pot is all of the revenue and what goes out the spending spout are all of the outlays.

The problem with this balanced budget amendment is that in using all of the Social Security income in counting whether or not you are balancing the budget, Social Security is not contributing to the deficit. Social Security is in surplus. And Social Security is in surplus for a reason. The reason is to prepare for the time when the baby boom generation retires. Because then these Social Security surpluses are going to turn to massive deficits. And